

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/808,303	Applicant(s) TAKAGI ET AL.	
	Examiner David D. Le	Art Unit 3681	

All Participants:

(1) David D. Le.

(2) Matthew Schneider.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 1 September 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 4

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's attorney authorizes examiner to amend the instant application as follows:

Claim 1:

Line 6, "the controlling portion" has been changed to --the controlling unit--; and

Lines 25-26, "a last but one" has been replaced with --an input value preceding the former--.

Claim 3:

Line 7, "a process for" has been removed;

Line 9, "a process for" has been removed;

Line 10, "wile" has been replaced with --while--;

Line 11, "the predetermined pre-charge pressure" has been replaced with --a predetermined pre-charge pressure--;

Line 15, "a process for" has been removed;

Line 17, "a process for" has been removed; and

Lines 21-22, "a last but one" has been replaced with --an input value preceding the former--.

Claim 4:

Line 3, "the engine rotation number" has been replaced with --an engine rotation number--.

Examiner also suggests that Figs. 11 and 12 should be labeled as "Prior Art". However, applicant's attorney disagrees with the suggestion, stating that Figs. 11 and 12 are not "Prior Art" and should be published as filed.